



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*The nations shall learn war no more.*

## THE ADVOCATE OF PEACE.

A MONTHLY JOURNAL

DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF PEACE BETWEEN  
INDIVIDUALS, CLASSES AND NATIONS.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, ONE DOLLAR A YEAR.  
SINGLE NUMBERS, TEN CENTS.

*Address all communications to*

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,  
3 Somerset Street, Boston, Mass.

### MR. CREMER'S MEMORIAL.

Hon. William Randal Cremer, M. P., one of the leaders of the arbitration movement in the British House of Commons and Secretary of the International Arbitration League, arrived in this country early in January, bearing with him a memorial signed by 354 members of the House of Commons, in favor of a permanent arbitration treaty between this country and Great Britain. The memorial is simple and direct and is as follows:

"In response to the resolution adopted by Congress on April 4, 1890, the British House of Commons, supported in its decision by Mr. Gladstone on June 16, 1893, unanimously affirmed its willingness to co-operate with the government of the United States in settling disputes between the two countries by means of arbitration.

"The undersigned members of the British Parliament, while cordially thanking Congress for having, by its resolution, given such an impetus to the movement and called forth such a response from our government, earnestly hope that Congress will follow up its resolution, and crown its desire by inviting our government to join in framing a treaty which shall bind the two nations to refer to arbitration disputes which diplomacy fails to adjust.

"Should such a proposal be made, our heartiest efforts would be used in its support, and we shall rejoice that the United States of America and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland have resolved to set such a splendid example to the other nations of the world."

This memorial Mr. Cremer presented to President Cleveland on the 18th ult. In presenting it he explained that the British Government was in favor of such a treaty. He said that in a general way the memorial had grown out of various expressions of sentiment and parliamentary resolutions in both countries endorsing the principle of arbitration. The more immediate cause of the appearance of the memorial at this time was, he stated, the resolution of Senator Allison in June last (previously introduced into the House by Mr. Lacey) requesting the President of the United States to negotiate a 25 years arbitration treaty with the Government of Great Britain.

Whatever may be the immediate effect of Mr. Cremer's memorial in bringing about the establishment of the proposed treaty between the two countries, it will prove to be an important one of the series of steps taken by the friends of peace on both sides of the water to make war hereafter impossible between England and this country. After all that had previously been done, our Government ought to have taken the next step towards such a treaty, without waiting to be memorialized again, and doubtless would have done so but for the perplexing condition of our home political affairs at the present time.

Mr. Cremer is highly gratified with the strength of the arbitration sentiment which he has found on all sides in this country. It is unfortunate, we think, that this sentiment, which is strong throughout our country and growing and spreading every day, is not better represented in an organized form in our National Legislature. In the House of Commons the movement for arbitration is not only well represented but well organized, a considerable number of members making it a distinct and prominent part of their program and working harmoniously together to take advantage of every suitable occasion and even to make occasion to promote the cause. We think our Congressmen in general are as much in favor of the movement as the British Commoners. Some of them could not do a nobler service to the country and to the world and at the same time add more to their reputation for political wisdom and insight than by taking up this subject in a systematic way and becoming responsible for pushing it. The United States, as Mr. Cremer thinks, is logically marked out by her character and disinterestedness, to lead the way in this movement and particularly to extend to Great Britain a direct invitation to join her in making the proposed treaty.

The appearance of this memorial signed by 354 members of Parliament, representing all shades of political opinion, is highly significant of the rapid and widely-extended change taking place in public sentiment on the subject of war. It is only twenty-one years ago that Henry Richard, after many years of discouraging opposition, succeeded in getting through the House of Commons, by a small majority, a resolution simply favoring the principle of arbitration. This was the first resolution of its kind ever passed in any country. Now we have, following the unanimous resolution of Parliament of June 16, 1893, the signatures of 354 members of the British Commons to a memorial not in favor of the principle of arbitration only, but of a specific application of it. This is remarkable progress.

It has been objected in this country by politicians and others that Great Britain wants an arbitration treaty with the United States, because this country is so great and powerful as to be feared by her, and therefore she wishes to tie our hands. With the smaller nations of the earth which she can bully into submission they say she would

not enter into any such treaty. Whatever ground there may be for this charge in relation to the English Government (we think there is small ground for it at the present time), nothing could be farther from the truth so far as concerns the movement represented by this memorial. The movement in the House of Commons for a treaty with our Government has come up from the people and not down from the Government. It is an expression of the sincere wish of a large and growing class of the English people that war may everywhere be abolished. It has fought its way to recognition at every step against the neglect and often the contempt of those in office, and is uncompromisingly opposed to the spirit of jingoism of which English officials have been frequently so guilty in their dealings with weak nations. It seeks an arbitration treaty with the United States, not that it may thereby tie our hands and keep us from interfering with English aggression, but as the first and most natural step towards the creation of a series of arbitration treaties which shall bind all the nations of the world together and make it impossible for any government to go to war.

We are glad that Mr. Cremer has met with so much encouragement at the Executive Mansion and the State Department and in his interviews with prominent Senators and others, and shall hope that his visit may result in the speedy opening of the negotiations which the memorial brought by him contemplates.

This century ought not to be allowed to close till this great step is taken toward the higher and diviner civilization which is to be the garb of the Twentieth Century.

#### THE FAILURE OF THE PARIS TRIBUNAL'S AWARD TO PRESERVE THE SEALS.

In December of this winter Professor Henry W. Elliott, the distinguished naturalist of the Smithsonian Institute, who knows more about Alaska and the fur seals perhaps than any other American, sent a letter to Congressman Dingley in which he seems to demonstrate conclusively that the putting into practice of the rules laid down by the Paris Tribunal, instead of resulting in the preservation of the seal herd, is actually hastening its destruction.

Professor Elliott had already given it as his judgment in August, 1893, soon after the Tribunal reached its decision, that the rules laid down, if carried into effect, would actually cause a larger catch by the pelagic sealers in 1894 than had been made in previous years. The figures show that his anticipation was correct. The number of skins taken by 65 Canadian schooners in 1892 was 20,385; by 55 schooners in 1893, 29,113; by 59 schooners in 1894, 38,044. The American fleet which is small, consisting of only five or six vessels, took 9419 skins in 1894, as against 7000 in 1893 and 4500 in 1892. This means, if continued, the swift extermination of seal life from the land and waters of Alaska.

The feeding ground of the seals is not limited by the 60 mile zone around the Pribyloff Islands. They go out 80 and 120 miles. Outside of the 60 mile limit the pelagic sealers are allowed to kill the seals except from first of May to the first of August, but are not allowed to use fire arms at any time. This prohibition of the use of fire arms, Professor Elliott says, is one of the fatal defects of the Paris regulations. With the spear the seals are killed silently and the herd is not frightened back into the protected zone. If fire arms were used, many of them would be scared by the noise and would flee back into the protected region about the Pribyloff Islands. As the regulations now stand, the seals will continue to go out into the choice feeding grounds beyond the 60 mile limit, to the west and southwest, until the last one is killed.

Last year only about half the pelagic fleet was outfitted with skilled native spearmen. This year the whole fleet will have native spearmen and the catch will probably be nearly twice as great.

In 1890 Professor Elliott carefully surveyed the breeding grounds on the Pribyloff Islands and found 600,000 female seals and about 8000 adult males, as against 1,500,000 females and 90,000 adult males which he found there in 1872-74. Of the bachelor or killable seals, permitted by the United States law to be taken on land, he found in 1890 only 100,000, or about one tenth of the number which existed in 1872, and fully 80,000 of these were pups only a year old.

The whole land catch last year was only 16,030 young male seals fit for market. The number will not be much over half as large this year, on account of the rapid destruction of the females which, though not allowed to be molested on the land, go out into the open sea beyond the 60 mile zone and are there killed by the pelagic sealers. It is this destruction of the females which the Paris rules have not only not prevented but have much increased. The whole herd at the present rate will be practically destroyed in less than ten years more.

Two courses of action are suggested by the Smithsonian naturalist: First, let us make a fair and honest attempt to enlist the aid of England in so modifying the Paris regulations as to protect the females in the open sea. If this can not be done, our Government should repeal the law of 1868-70 prohibiting the killing of the females on land, so that we may at least get our share of the herd while it is being destroyed, and turn the proceeds into the public treasury to meet the expense which we now have to undergo in keeping our patrol ships in Behring Sea during the close season.

If the facts are as here stated, and there is little reason to believe the contrary, it ought to be a comparatively easy matter for the two Governments of the United States and Great Britain to arrive at such a modification of the present regulations as will result in the preserva-